

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403  
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 23 and 25-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 23, 25 and 26 are amended, and claims 5 and 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter set forth therein.

No new matter is presented by this Amendment. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the Abstract, the previously presented claims, paragraphs 0038 and 0049 and in the drawings of the published patent application US 2003/0105981. The claims are amended to further recite features of the invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

#### **A. The 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 9-19, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Squier et al. (US 7,188,181). Claim 1 is amended to recite the features of prior claim 5. Arguments for the allowability of claim 1 are provided in the subsequent section relating to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 23 is amended to recite the features of prior claim 24. Claim 23 now recites:

“the first system inputting information from the second system, and in response, the first system outputting, to the second system, a determination that the first system has a valid session credential for the client at the first system, and the second system effecting successful authentication so as to grant access, to the further protected resource on the second system, to the client based on the determination from the first system that the client has a valid session credential with the first system”

On page 3 the Office Action asserts that this method is allegedly taught by Squier. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Although the Office Action rejects claim 23, the Office Action does not recite a particular portion of Squier that teaches these specific method

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403  
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

steps.

Applicant submits that these method steps are not taught by the portions of Squire generally cited, nor the figures referenced therein. For example, both figures 2A and 2B, as described in the portions of Squire cited in the Office Action, demonstrate that the authentication process described in Squier is *complete* once the client's credentials with the destination server are established: "and the user can now freely access services on the destination server" (column 6 lines 59-60). For example, the finality of the method as taught by Squire is further evidenced by the step "Done" after step 220 in Figure 2B. Thus, Squier does not teach any further communication of credentials between systems once the user has achieved access.

Amended claim 23, however, recites additional steps after the client is granted access. The method accomplishes the validation of credentials on a first system "based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system." Then, claim 23 recites: "the first system outputting, to the second system, a determination that the first system has a valid session credential for the client at the first system." This portion of the claimed method recites where the first system notifies another server of the client's credentials on the first system. Squier does not teach the interrelationship of this step in the method with the other various features of claim 23. Therefore, Applicant submits that such an output as recited in claim 23 is not taught by Squier.

Amended claim 23 further recites: "the second system effecting successful authentication... based on the determination from the first system that the client has a valid session credential with the first system." Squier does not teach that the second system (that

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403  
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

initially possessed a basis for authentication of the client) would subsequently base its determination of authentication of the client on the authentication determination subsequently received from the *first system*.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 23 is allowable for at least these reasons, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested. Applicant further submits that claims 9, 12-13 and 17 are allowable for similar reasons, and the claims dependent on these independent claims are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claims.

**B. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 5, 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. in view of Howard et al. (US 6,584,505). As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of prior claim 5. On page 5 the Office Action rejects prior claim 5 as allegedly taught by Squier in view of Howard (see column 6 lines 51-52 and column 8 lines 54-57). Applicant respectfully traverses. Amended claim 1 now recites:

“directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the *first system*, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system”

The Office Action alleges that the cited portion of Howard teaches:

“directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the *second system*, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged teaching does not support the rejection. Firstly, the Office Action misquotes the claim language and substitutes “second system” where the claim actually reads “first system.” Therefore the alleged teaching does not teach the method as recited in claim 1. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Howard does not

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403  
ATTORNEY DOCKET. 72167.000570

teach "authentication at the first system" as recited in claim 1. The cited portion of Howard teaches how a user is redirected from a destination server to an authentication server where authentication is achieved and that authentication forms the basis for access credentials. Claim 1 recites a different method where the credentials are based on successful authentication at the *first system*.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Applicant further submits that claims 10-12 and 20 are allowable for similar reasons, and the claims dependent on these independent claims are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claims.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squier et al. and further in view of Marks et al. (US 20010054059). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that the modification of Squier in view of Marks would not teach claims 25 or 26 as currently recited. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 25 and 26 are allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### C. CONCLUSION


For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

PATENT APPLICATION 10/026,403  
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 72167.000570

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS

  
James R. Miner  
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams  
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500

Dated: JAN. 4, 2008

JRM/ad-snd1218/PTO 010408